



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,418	09/18/2003	Erik Lilliebjerg	NVID-P000635	7450
45594	7590	02/11/2009	EXAMINER	
NVIDIA C/O MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP TWO NORTH MARKET STREET THIRD FLOOR SAN JOSE, CA 95113			TO, JENNIFER N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2195	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/11/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/666,418	Applicant(s) LILLIEBJERG, ERIK	
	Examiner JENNIFER N. TO	Art Unit 2195	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-7,9-14 and 16-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-7,9-14 and 16-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-23 are pending for examination. Claims 1, 8, and 15 are canceled by applicant. This office action is responding to applicant reply filed 11/14/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 2-5, and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. The claim language in the following claims is not clearly understood:

i. as per claim 2, line 10, it is not clearly understood what is meant by "designating said executing task a waiting task" (i.e. designating said executing task as a waiting task). Lines 13-14, it is not clearly understood what is meant by "designating said waiting task an interrupted task" (i.e. designating said waiting task as an interrupted task). Line 17, it is not clearly understood what is meant by "designating said executing task an interrupted task" (i.e. designating said executing task as an interrupted task).

Art Unit: 2195

- ii. as per claim 9, it has the same deficiency as claim 2 above.

Appropriate correction is required.

- iii. as per claims 3-5, and 10-12, they are rejected for incorporating the above errors from their respective parent claims by dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

- 5. Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shi et al. (hereafter Shi) (U.S. Patent No. 6757897).

- 6. Shi was cited in the previous office action.

- 7. As per claim 21, Shi teaches the invention as claim including a method of executing a plurality of tasks of different priority values (abstract, lines 1-5; col. 3, lines 66-67), said method comprising:

Art Unit: 2195

utilizing preemptive multitasking and cooperative multitasking in execution of said tasks (abstract; col. 11, line 54 through col. 12, line 10);

while a task is executing, receiving a request for a particular waiting period from said task (abstract; col. 3, line 65 through col. 4, lines 13);

for duration of said particular waiting period, suspending execution of said task (col. 4, lines 13-16); and

selecting a next task to execute based on said priority values of said tasks and based on status designations representative of execution progress of said tasks (col. 12, lines 44-47), wherein said preemptive multitasking and said cooperative multitasking increase utilization of processing power of a processor and ensure higher priority valued tasks are executed with less interruption time than lower priority valued tasks ((Shi teaches utilizing preemptive multitasking and cooperative multitasking, and it is well known in the art that using preemptive and cooperative multitasking would increase utilization of processing power of a processor and ensure higher priority valued tasks are executed with less interruption time than lower priority valued tasks. Thus, Shi inherently teaches this limitation).

8. As per claim 22, it is a computer-readable medium claim that corresponding to method claim 21. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as method claim 21 set forth above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 2-5, and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shi et al. (hereafter Shi) (U.S. Patent No. 6757897).

11. As per claim 2, Shi teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 21 above including:

selecting a task from said tasks based on said priority values and said status designations, wherein said status designations include executing, waiting, and completed (fig. 3, step 400, col. 14, lines 14-33);

starting said selected task and designating said selected task an executing task (fig. 3, step 400, col. 14, lines 14-33);

if said executing task requests a waiting period, suspending said executing task and designating said executing task a waiting task and repeating said selecting said task and said starting said selected task (fig. 3, step 401; col. 14, lines 34-53; col. 22, lines 37-62);

if said waiting period elapses for any waiting task and said executing task has a higher priority value than said waiting task, and allowing said executing task to continue execution (col. 23, lines 18-31);

if said waiting period elapses for any waiting task and said executing task does not have a higher priority value than said waiting task, suspending said executing task and repeating said selecting task and said starting said selected task (col. 23, line 36 through col. 24, line 25); and

if said executing task completes execution, designating said executing task a completed task and repeating said selecting said task and said starting said selected task (col. 22, line 30 through col. 23, line 24).

12. Shi did not specifically teach in details that the status designation include interrupt and un-start, designating waiting task as an interrupted task, and designating executing task as an interrupted task.

13. However, Shi's system capable of designating (setting) the status of the task once their execution stages is change (col. 22, lines 40-52; col. 23, lines 27-35). It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to try to modify Shi's designating step to included interrupt and un-start statuses as well as designating task to be interrupted task if the task being interrupted to thereby produce a system that scheduling tasks based on the priority and status of the task as suggested in Shi (col. 12, lines 45-47).

14. As per claim 3, Shi teaches that wherein said selecting said task includes selecting higher priority values before selecting lower priority values when possible (col. 23, line 45 through col. 24, line 23).

15. As per claim 4, Shi teaches that wherein said selecting said task includes if a first particular task cannot be executed until a second particular task has completed execution, enabling selection of said first particular task after said second particular task has completed execution (col. 23, line 45 through col. 24, line 23).

16. As per claim 5, Shi further teaches setting a timer based on said waiting period (col. 14, lines 40-42, setting internal timer).

17. As per claim 9-12, they are a computer-readable medium claims that corresponding to method claims 2-5. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as method claims 2-5 set forth above.

18. Claims 6-7, 13-14, and 16-20, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shi et al (hereafter Shi) (U.S. Patent No. 6757897), as applied in claims 21 and 22 above, and in view of Abgrall (U.S. Patent No. 6401202).

Art Unit: 2195

19. As per claim 6, Shi teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 21 above. Shi did not specifically teach tasks are BIOS initialized tasks.

20. However, Abgrall teaches tasks are BIOS initialized tasks (abstract; col. 1, lines 6-7; col. 2, lines 31-32; col. 11, lines 21-25).

21. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teaching of Shi and Abgrall because Shi suggested that the tasks can be any type of tasks in any type of computing device (col. 25, lines 2-3), and Abgrall teaching of tasks are BIOS initialized tasks would improved the integrity of Shi's system by extending the usability of Shi's system into perform multitasking during BIOS boot-up (Abgrall, col. 1, lines 62-63).

22. As per claim 7, Abgrall teaches BIOS kernel receives said request for said particular waiting period (col. 11, lines 30-34).

23. As per claim 13-14, they are a computer-readable medium claims that corresponding to method claims 6-7. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as method claims 6-7 set forth above.

24. As per claim 23, Shi teaches the invention substantially as claim including a system comprising:

a processor (fig. 1, item 101); and

the system operative to utilize preemptive multitasking and cooperative multitasking to increase utilization of processing power of said processor and to ensure higher priority valued tasks are executed with less interruption time than lower priority valued tasks (Shi teaches utilizing preemptive multitasking and cooperative multitasking, and it is well known in the art that using preemptive and cooperative multitasking would increase utilization of processing power of a processor and ensure higher priority valued tasks are executed with less interruption time than lower priority valued tasks. Thus, Shi inherently teaches this limitation) when executing a plurality of tasks of different priority values (col. 25, lines 4-5), and wherein the system is operative to receive a request for a particular waiting period from a task while said task is executing (abstract; col. 3, line 65 through col. 4, lines 13), wherein said system is operative to suspend execution of said task for a duration of said particular waiting period (col. 4, lines 13-16), and wherein said system is operative to select a next task to execute based on said priority values of said tasks and based on status designations representative of execution progress of said tasks (col. 12, lines 44-47).

25. Shi did not specifically teach the system is BIOS, and tasks are BIOS initialized tasks.

Art Unit: 2195

26. However, Abgrall teaches the system is BIOS, and tasks are BIOS initialized tasks (abstract; col. 1, lines 6-7; col. 2, lines 31-32; col. 11, lines 21-25).

27. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teaching of Shi and Abgrall because Shi suggested that the tasks can be any type of tasks in any type of computing device (col. 25, lines 2-3), and Abgrall teaching of tasks are BIOS initialized tasks would improved the integrity of Shi's system by extending the usability of Shi's system into perform multitasking during BIOS boot-up (Abgrall, col. 1, lines 62-63).

28. As per claim 16, Shi teaches wherein said selecting said task includes selecting higher priority values before selecting lower priority values when possible (col. 23, line 45 through col. 24, line 23).

29. As per claim 17, Shi teaches that wherein said selecting said task includes if a first particular task cannot be executed until a second particular task has completed execution, enabling selection of said first particular task after said second particular task has completed execution (col. 23, line 45 through col. 24, line 23).

30. As per claim 18, Shi further teaches a timer (col. 14, lines 40-42).

Art Unit: 2195

31. As per claim 19, Abgrall teaches wherein said BIOS includes a BIOS kernel for receiving requests for said particular waiting period from said initialized tasks (col. 11, lines 30-34).

32. As per claim 20, Abgrall further teaches a plurality of hardware components (fig. 2).

Response to Arguments

33. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

34. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure (see PTO 892 form for details).

35. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory

Art Unit: 2195

period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

36. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JENNIFER N. TO whose telephone number is (571)272-7212. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 6AM- 3:30 PM, F 6AM- 2:30 PM.

37. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

38. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Art Unit: 2195

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Meng-Ai An/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2195

/Jennifer N. To/
Patent Examiner
AU 2195